

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

RICHARD J. SILVERBERG	:	
	:	
v.	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	
	:	NO. 25-2729
DUPONT DE NEMOURS INC. <i>ET AL.</i>	:	

AMENDED ORDER

AND NOW, this 4th day of August, 2025, upon consideration of Plaintiff’s Complaint,¹ filed May 27, 2025 (ECF No. 1); the Joint Motion for Pre-Filing Injunction and Dismissal filed by 24 of the 32 Defendants named in Plaintiff’s Complaint² (“Joint Motion,” ECF No. 13); Plaintiff’s Response and Amended Response to the Joint Motion (ECF Nos. 16, 20); and the Moving Defendants’ letter to the Court dated July 30, 2025 (on file with Court), the Court’s July 31, 2025 Order is **AMENDED**³ and it is **ORDERED** as follows:

1. The time for Defendants to answer, move, or otherwise respond to Plaintiff’s Complaint is **STAYED** pending the Court’s ruling on the Joint Motion or further Order of the Court.
2. All discovery, including the disclosures required under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a), is **STAYED** pending the Court’s ruling on the Joint Motion or further Order of the Court.
3. The parties **SHALL NOT** file any further pleadings or amended pleadings pending the Court’s ruling on the Joint Motion or further Order of the Court.
4. The Clerk of Court shall **STRIKE** any pleadings or amended pleadings submitted or filed in violation of Paragraph 3 of this Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ R. Barclay Surrick
R. BARCLAY SURRICK, J.

¹ This lawsuit—*Silverberg V*—is the fifth related lawsuit that Plaintiff, *pro se* attorney Richard Silverberg, has filed since May 2019. (See *Silverberg v. City of Philadelphia, et al.*, No. 19-2691, filed May 20,

2019 (“*Silverberg I*”); *Silverberg, et al. v. City of Philadelphia, et al.*, No. 20-5034, filed October 12, 2020 (“*Silverberg II*”); *Silverberg v. DuPont de Nemours, Inc., et al.*, No. 23-1868, filed May 17, 2023 (“*Silverberg III*”); *Silverberg v. DuPont de Nemours, Inc., et al.*, No. 24-924, filed March 4, 2024 (“*Silverberg IV*”). Silverberg’s 12-count Complaint in this action asserts claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983; the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1961, *et seq.*; and state common law that are similar if not essentially identical to those asserted in his previous related lawsuits. (*Compare Silverberg V* Compl., ECF No. 1 with *Silverberg I* Am. Compl. (12 counts), ECF No. 19; *Silverberg II* Am. Compl. (22 counts), ECF No. 14; *Silverberg III* Am. Compl. (13 counts), ECF No. 81; *Silverberg IV* Am. Compl. (12 counts), ECF No. 64.) Six of the Defendants in this action were named in all of Plaintiff’s previous related actions, and an additional 19 of the Defendants were named in two or three of those lawsuits. *Silverberg I, III, and IV* were dismissed by this Court at the pleading stage, and Plaintiff voluntarily dismissed *Silverberg II*. (*See Silverberg I*, ECF Nos. 38, 39; *Silverberg III*, ECF Nos. 171, 173; *Silverberg IV*, ECF Nos. 118, 121; *Silverberg II*, ECF No. 30.) The Third Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the dismissal of *Silverberg I*. *Silverberg v. City of Philadelphia*, 847 F. App’x 152, 154 (3d Cir. 2021). Plaintiff’s appeals of the dismissals of *Silverberg III* and *IV* are pending before the Third Circuit. *See Silverberg III*, 2024 WL 4566110 (E.D. Pa. Oct. 24, 2024), *appeal docketed*, No. 24-2867 (3d Cir. Oct. 8, 2024); *Silverberg IV*, 2025 WL 1314088 (E.D. Pa. May 5, 2025), *appeal docketed*, No. 25-1642 (3d Cir. April 4, 2025).

² The Joint Motion was filed by the following Defendants: DuPont de Nemours, Inc.; Dow, Inc.; The Vanguard Group, Inc.; Timothy Buckley; City of Philadelphia; James Kenney; Diana Cortes, Esquire; Marissa O’Connell, Esquire; Brian R. Cullin, Esquire; William Penn Foundation; Janet Haas, M.D.; Liberty Mutual Group, Inc.; David Long; Edward Breen; Marcel S. Pratt, Esquire; Ballard Spahr LLP; International Flavors and Fragrances, Inc.; Gary F. Seitz, Esquire; Gellert Scali Busenkell & Brown LLC; Andrew Liveris; Corteva, Inc.; Andreas Fibig; Avantor, Inc.; Andrew Liveris; and Rajiv Gupta (collectively, the “Moving Defendants”).

³ The Court’s July 31, 2025 Order is amended solely to clarify that the Court has not granted or otherwise ruled on the Joint Motion, which is under consideration by the Court.